

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**  
**OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS**  
**No. 20-1970V**

DON SHIELDS,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: January 27, 2025

*Sean Franks Greenwood, The Greenwood Law Firm, Houston, TX, for Petitioner.*

*Sarah Rifkin Black, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

**DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>**

On December 23, 2020, Don Shields filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleges that he suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration ("SIRVA") caused by an influenza vaccine administered on October 24, 2018. Pet. at 1. On November 26, 2024, I issued a ruling finding Petitioner entitled to compensation and decision awarding damages following briefing by the parties. ECF No. 41.

---

<sup>1</sup>Because this Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action taken in this case, it must be made publicly accessible and will be posted on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website, and/or at <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/uscourts/national/cofc>, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2018) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2018).

Petitioner has now filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, requesting an award of \$21,563.81 (representing \$20,859.65 for attorney's fees and \$704.16 for attorney's costs). Petitioner Application for Attorneys' Fees, filed Dec. 6, 2024, ECF No. 46; Billing Records and Receipts, filed Dec. 6, 2024, ECF No. 45. In accordance with General Order No. 9, counsel for Petitioner represents that Petitioner incurred no out-of-pocket expenses. ECF No. 47.

Respondent reacted to the motion on December 11, 2024, representing that he is satisfied that the statutory requirements for an award of attorney's fees and costs are met in this case, but deferring resolution of the amount to be awarded to my discretion. Respondent's Response to Motion at 2-3, 3 n.2, ECF No. 48. Petitioner filed no reply.

Having considered the motion along with the invoices and other proof filed in connection, I find a reduction in the amount of costs to be awarded appropriate, for the reason set forth below.

### ANALYSIS

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Section 15(e). Counsel must submit fee requests that include contemporaneous and specific billing records indicating the service performed, the number of hours expended on the service, and the name of the person performing the service. *See Savin v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 85 Fed. Cl. 313, 316-18 (2008). Counsel should not include in their fee requests hours that are "excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary." *Saxton v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 3 F.3d 1517, 1521 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (quoting *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 434 (1983)). It is "well within the special master's discretion to reduce the hours to a number that, in [her] experience and judgment, [is] reasonable for the work done." *Id.* at 1522. Furthermore, the special master may reduce a fee request *sua sponte*, apart from objections raised by respondent and without providing a petitioner notice and opportunity to respond. *See Sabella v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 86 Fed. Cl. 201, 209 (2009). A special master need not engage in a line-by-line analysis of petitioner's fee application when reducing fees. *Broekelschen v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 102 Fed. Cl. 719, 729 (2011).

The petitioner "bears the burden of establishing the hours expended, the rates charged, and the expenses incurred." *Wasson v. Sec'y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 24 Cl. Ct. 482, 484 (1991). The Petitioner "should present adequate proof [of the attorney's fees and costs sought] at the time of the submission." *Wasson*, 24 Cl. Ct. at 484 n.1.

Petitioner's counsel "should make a good faith effort to exclude from a fee request hours that are excessive, redundant, or otherwise unnecessary, just as a lawyer in private practice ethically is obligated to exclude such hours from his fee submission." *Hensley*, 461 U.S. at 434.

### ATTORNEY FEES

The rates requested for work performed through the end of 2024 are reasonable and consistent with our prior determinations, and will therefore be adopted.<sup>3</sup>

Regarding the time billed, I note this case required additional briefing regarding entitlement and damages. See Petitioner's Motion for Ruling on the Record, filed Oct. 17, 2023, ECF No. 39. Petitioner's counsel expended approximately 19.3 hours drafting the motion and 1.9 hours reviewing Respondent's response. ECF No. 45-2 at 9-10. I find this amount of time to be reasonable and will award the attorney's fees requested.

### ATTORNEY COSTS

Petitioner has provided supporting documentation for all but expenses of \$6.00 in costs. ECF No. 45-2 at 11; ECF No 45-3. The \$6.00 costs which lacks supporting documentation is described appears to be a notary fee. ECF No. 45-2 at 11. There is no additional documentation or information showing whether this was a cost paid to an outside notary or is a portion of the cost of maintaining notary status for a member of Petitioner's counsel's firm. If the later, the cost is considered overhead and not reimbursable under the Vaccine Program. I will, however, reimburse the remainder of the costs - \$698.16.

### CONCLUSION

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs for successful claimants. Section 15(e). **I award a total of \$21,557.81 (representing \$20,859.65 for attorney's fees and \$698.16 for attorney's costs) to be paid through an ACH deposit to Petitioner's counsel's IOLTA account for prompt disbursement.**

---

<sup>3</sup> Regarding this issue, I would note that the bar admission date listed for Ms. Kayleigh Smith (2015) does not match what our internal records show, or what is publicly available (2016). Petitioner's counsel should check this date and clarify in future motions which year is correct.

In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in accordance with this Decision.<sup>4</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**  
Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master

---

<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.